

September 8, 2016

Chairman Tom Wheeler Commissioner Mignon Clyburn Commissioner Michael O'Rielly Commissioner Ajit Pai Commissioner Jessica Rosenworcel Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street SW Washington DC, 20554

Dear Chairman Wheeler and Commissioners Clyburn, O'Rielly, Pai, and Rosenworcel:

I am writing on behalf of enTouch Systems, Inc.(enTouch), a small multichannel video programming distributor (MVPD) providing digital service in Texas, about the Federal Communications Commission's (Commission) Navigation Device proceeding (MB Docket No. 16-42/CS Docket No. 97-80). enTouch has been in business for 20 years providing internet, cable tv, voice, and security monitoring service to the suburbs and rural areas surrounding Houston, Texas. We have about 120 employees and serve roughly 8500 video subscribers. We were the first to provide 1 Gbps internet service to the Greater Houston market and continue to innovate across our products as we compete with all the major providers in our area. We are headquartered in our community and for most of our service territory, we are the ONLY local alternative to providers with a national footprint. We are troubled by the Commission's proposed rules and other potential substitute rules because, if adopted, the substantial implementation costs would force my company to cease offering video service. Accordingly, we urge you not to apply new rules to smaller MVPDs.

Like other smaller MVPDs, enTouch faces major challenges in our pay-TV business. Programmers are demanding significant and growing fees and increasing carriage of "unwanted" networks. Our customers have more video choices both from much larger, traditional pay-TV providers and from over-the-top video sources, which often provide comparable services at lower costs. As a result, our margins are slim and continue to erode. Yet despite our troubles, our customers appreciate receiving video service from us because our offerings and customer service meets their needs. For instance, we offer TV Everywhere options for all cable customers and have made it easier for customers to automatically find HD programming. We also offer better, local customer service from employees that live in the communities they serve. We offer the fastest internet in our area with fiber-based 1Gbps speeds and competitive bundles including quadruple-play bundles not available from our competitors.

Given this daunting business environment, our company cannot afford the additional regulatory costs of the proposed Navigation Device rules, estimated to be at least \$1 million per system, or any other proposals that require such substantial costs. ¹ Simply put, we could not

www.EnTouch.net phone: 281.225.1000 fax: 281.225.0589

This estimate covers those requirements that are known and sufficiently refined and are based on cable operators satisfying the Commission's proposal at the lowest overall cost possible (i.e. by deploying a gateway



offset or otherwise tolerate these costs even if we diverted our limited capital spending and spent our cash reserves. And, raising customer prices significantly is out of the question. Should the Commission mandate that small providers spend this much money to comply with such rules, we would be forced to cease offering video service. This outcome is certain even if the deadline for compliance is delayed because any solutions that the industry will, if ever, develop for smaller MVPDs are still going to be unaffordable for a company of our size.

On behalf of our customers and our employees, we urge the Commission not to apply any new Navigation Device requirements to smaller MVPDs. Forcing our company to cease offering video service does not advance the asserted purpose of the proposed rules – to promote innovation and lower consumer prices. Instead, it eliminates a local service option for consumers, and it means the loss of jobs and tax and fee revenues for our community, among other harms.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

J Lyn Findley President & CEO

enTouch Systems, Inc.

Cc: Senator John Cornyn

Senator Ted Cruz

Congressman Kevin Brady

Congressman John Culberson

Congressman Michael McCaul

Congressman Pete Olson

Congressman Ted Poe

device in the customers' homes using third party devices). As others have explained, the Commission's proposal is more a framework with many elements still to be defined and fleshed out. Therefore, one cannot determine whether the predicted lowest cost means is ultimately technologically feasible, what additional costs are necessary and the size of those additional costs, and when this solution would be available to implement. Moreover, given that many larger cable operators are making investments to deliver their services in an all-IP format, there is doubt whether vendors will invest in developing this lowest cost solution when only mid-sized and smaller MVPDs would be utilizing it as a means of complying with the Commission's proposal. If such a solution does not materialize in the market, mid-sized and smaller MVPDs may need to incur far greater costs to satisfy the Commission's proposal by offering their services in all-IP.